

**REMARKS**

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Advisory Action of June 16, 2005. Applicant was surprised to receive the Advisory Action inasmuch as the MPEP, at Section 706.07(f) and 714.13 makes it quite clear that an advisory action is only appropriate in responding to an amendment after final rejection. Applicant's April Amendment was filed in response to the Office Action of October 7, 2004, an Office Action which was non-final.

After the telephone discussion with the Examiner on July 6, 2005 Applicant now understands that the Notice of Appeal (filed Oct. 8, 2004), which clearly explains that it was filed (1) as a precautionary measure to maintain the pendency of this application in the event an Action was not issued prior to the end of the six month statutory period measured from the Action of April 9, 2004 and (2) which referred only to the Action of April 9, 2004, was mistakenly taken to be an appeal from the Action of October 7, 2004. In fact when the Notice of Appeal was filed Applicant had no knowledge of the October 7, 2004 Action. In any event during the telephone conversation of July 6, 2005 the Applicant indicated a desire to cancel the rejected claims so as to put this application in condition for allowance. The Examiner indicated that any amendment should be accompanied by a request for a one month extension of time. Applicant is also willing to file a withdrawal of the appeal although that action appears unnecessary in the event the Examiner finds the application in condition for allowance.

Applicant appreciates the indication that claims 26-30, 43-55, 58-61, 113-115, 126-133, 139-141 and 152-173 are allowed as amended. Applicant assumes that the Amendment of April 5, 2005 has been entered at least as to the allowed claims.

Applicant calls the Examiner's attention to an error in the representation of claims 114, 115 and 127 in the April 4, 2005 Amendment. In particular those claims were amended to make them independent by adding the text of their respective parent claims. That Amendment changed the paragraph identifications. In particular what had been paragraph (c) became

paragraph (h). Paragraph (d) (now paragraph (i)) had referred back to paragraph (c). When the paragraph identifications were amended in the April 05 Amendment, the reference back to paragraph (c) was not changed as it should have been. Accordingly this Amendment corrects that error in claims 114, 115 and 127 by changing the paragraph reference in paragraph (i) from paragraph (c) to the correct paragraph (h).

The Advisory Action indicated that claims 56-57, 62-70, 76-112, 116-125, 134-138, 142-151 and 174-181 were rejected.

By this Amendment, Applicant has canceled, without prejudice, the claims which the Action indicated were rejected.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that each of the claims now pending in this application, that is, claims 26-30, 43-55, 58-61, 113-115, 126-133, 139-141 and 152-173 is either allowed or in condition for allowance.

In the amendment of May 11, 2000 Applicant requested approval of proposed changes to several figures of drawings. A copy of the letter and proposed changes is attached. The Examiner's approval of the proposed changes is requested. Once approval is noted Applicant will obtain formal drawings.

Dated:

7/8/05

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Stanley B. Green

Registration No.: 24,351  
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP  
1990 M Street, N.W., Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20036-3425  
(202) 331-7111  
(202) 293-6229 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant